

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF
KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE
DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF
JULY 2008 BEFORE**

**THE HON^{BLE} JUSTICE N KUMAR
WRIT PETITION NO. 7953 OF 2007 (GM-RES)**

BETWEEN:

**Sri. H Ramakrishna Gowda
Aged about 48 years
Managing Director
Karnataka State Coir Development Corporation Ltd.,
Post Box No.198
42, 1st Floor, M.C. & A House
Miller Road, Bangalore 560 052 Petitioner**

(By Sri. V Srinivas, Advocate)

And

**1. Karnataka Information Commission
M S Building, Bangalore
Represented by its Commissioner**

**2. Sri. R Mohan Kumar
No.8, Jameya Complex
Maddur Town, Mandya District. Respondent**

(By Sri. Veerappa, AGA for R1: Respondent -2 Served)

**This Writ Petition is filed under Articles 226 and 227 of the
Constitution of India, praying to call for records in KIC 482 COM
2007 on the file of first respondent i.e. Karnataka State
Information Commission and etc.,**

This Writ Petition coming on for preliminary hearing this day, the Court made the following:

ORDER

1. The Petitioner who is the Managing Director of the Karnataka State Coir Development Corporation Limited, has preferred this writ petition challenging the order of the Chief Information Commissioner of State of Karnataka, where he has been directed to furnish the particulars sought for by the second respondent.

2. The particulars sought for are in the nature of the property at Mysore, where is residing, belongs to him, whether the same has been disclosed in the declaration to be given and who are the members of his family and in whose name the property stands. The grievance of the petitioner is that furnishing of the said particulars would result in unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual and therefore under Section 8 of the Right to Information Act, 2005, there is exemption from disclosure of information, .

3. I do not find any substance in the said contention. Section 8 of the Right to Information act, 2005, no doubt deals with exemption from disclosure of information. Clause (j) of Section 8 deals with information which relates to personal information, the disclosure of which has no relationship to any public activity or interest, or which would cause unwarranted invasion of the privacy of the individual unless the Central Public Information officer, or the State Public Information Officer or the appellate authority, as the case may be, is satisfied that the larger public interest justifies the disclosure of such information, provided that the information which can not be denied to the Parliament or a State Legislature shall not be denied to any person.

4. Every public servant has to disclose all his assets and members of his family. In fact the said disclosure has been made by the petitioner in the usual course. The particulars sought for is with reference to the said particulars which he has already disclosed. Therefore, as is clear from clause (j) of Section 8, such information is not exempted.. Therefore, the authorities were justified in passing the impugned order. No

case for interference is made out. Hence writ petition is dismissed.

**Sd/-
JUDGE**